

Ultrametricity and metric betweenness in tangent spaces to metric spaces

O. Dovgoshey and D. Dordovskyi

Abstract

The paper deals with pretangent spaces to general metric spaces. An ultrametricity criterion for pretangent spaces is found and it is closely related to the metric betweenness in the pretangent spaces.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 54E35.

Key words: Metric spaces; Tangent spaces; Ultrametric spaces; Metric betweenness.

1 Introduction

Analysis on metric spaces with no a priori smooth structure is in need of some generalized differentiations. Important examples of such generalizations and even an axiomatics of so-called "pseudo-gradients" can be found in [1, 3, 4, 10, 14, 16, 21] and, respectively, in [2]. A linear structure, and so a differentiation, for separable metric spaces can be obtained via their isometric embeddings into dual spaces of separable Banach spaces. For the application of this approach to develop a rather complete theory of rectifiable sets and currents on metric spaces see [3, 4]. Another natural way to obtain suitable differentiations on metric spaces is to induce some tangents at the points of these space. The Gromov–Hausdorff convergence and the ultra-convergence are, probably, the most widely applied today's tools for the construction of such tangent spaces (see, for example, [8, 9] and, respectively, [7, 17]). Recently a new approach to the introduction of the tangent spaces at the points of general metric spaces was proposed in [13]. Our paper is devoted to the study of the last tangent spaces. We find necessary and sufficient conditions under which the tangent spaces are ultrametric, see Theorem 2.9 below. Our second main result is Theorem 3.2 that completely describes metric spaces for which tangents are, roughly speaking, the snowflaked versions of subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. For convenience we recall the main notions from [13], see also [11].

Let (X, d) be a metric space. Fix a sequence $\tilde{r}$ of positive real numbers r_n which tend to zero. In what follows this sequence $\tilde{r}$ will be called a

normalizing sequence. Let us denote by $\tilde{X}$ the set of all sequence of points from X .

Definition 1.1. Two sequence $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \tilde{X}$, $\tilde{x} = \{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\tilde{y} = \{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are mutually stable with respect to (w.r.t.) a normalizing sequence $\tilde{r} = \{r_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if there is a finite limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{r_n} =: \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}). \quad (1.1)$$

We shall say that a family $\tilde{F} \subseteq \tilde{X}$ is *self-stable* (w.r.t. $\tilde{r}$) if every two $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \tilde{F}$ are mutually stable. A family $\tilde{F} \subseteq \tilde{X}$ is *maximal self-stable* if $\tilde{F}$ is self-stable and for an arbitrary $\tilde{z} \in \tilde{X} \setminus \tilde{F}$ there is $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{F}$ such that $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{z}$ are not mutually stable.

A standard application of Zorn's lemma leads to the following

Proposition 1.2. Let (X, d) be a metric space and let $p \in X$. Then for every normalizing sequence $\tilde{r} = \{r_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ there exists a maximal self-stable family $\tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}}$ such that $\tilde{p} = \{p, p, \dots\} \in \tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}}$.

Consider a function $\tilde{d} : \tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}} \times \tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ is defined by (1.1). Obviously, $\tilde{d}$ is symmetric and nonnegative. Moreover, the triangle inequality implies

$$\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \leq \tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) + \tilde{d}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y})$$

for all $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}$ from $\tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}}$. Hence $(\tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}}, \tilde{d})$ is a pseudometric space.

Define a relation $\sim$ on $\tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}}$ by $\tilde{x} \sim \tilde{y}$ if and only if $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = 0$. Then $\sim$ is an equivalence relation. Let us denote by $\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X = \Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}$ the set of equivalence classes in $\tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}}$ under the equivalence relation $\sim$. If a function ρ is defined on $\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}} \times \Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}$ by

$$\rho(\alpha, \beta) = \tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \quad (1.2)$$

for $\tilde{x} \in \alpha$ and $\tilde{y} \in \beta$, then ρ is the well-defined metric on $\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}$. The metric identification of $(\tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}}, \tilde{d})$ is, by definition, the metric space $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}, \rho)$.

Definition 1.3. The space $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X, \rho)$ is pretangent to the space X at the point p w.r.t. a normalizing sequence $\tilde{r}$.

Note that $\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}} \neq \emptyset$ because the constant sequence $\tilde{p}$ belongs to $\tilde{X}_{p, \tilde{r}}$, see Proposition 1.2.

Let $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an infinite, strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers. Let us denote by $\tilde{r}'$ the subsequence $\{r_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the normalizing sequence $\tilde{r} = \{r_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and let $\tilde{x}' := \{x_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ for every $\tilde{x} = \{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \tilde{X}$.

It is clear that if $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{y}$ are mutually stable w.r.t. $\tilde{r}$, then $\tilde{x}'$ and $\tilde{y}'$ are mutually stable w.r.t. $\tilde{r}'$ and

$$\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}'}(\tilde{x}', \tilde{y}'). \quad (1.3)$$

If $\tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}}$ is a maximal self-stable (w.r.t. $\tilde{r}$) family, then, by Zorn's lemma, there exists a maximal self-stable (w.r.t. $\tilde{r}'$) family $\tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}'}$ such that

$$\{\tilde{x}' : \tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}}\} \subseteq \tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}'}.$$

Denote by $in_{\tilde{r}'}$ the mapping from $\tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}}$ to $\tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}'}$ with $in_{\tilde{r}'}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}'$ for all $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}}$. It follows from (1.3) that, after the metric identifications, $in_{\tilde{r}'}$ pass to an isometric embedding $em' : \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X \rightarrow \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'}^X$ under which the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}} & \xrightarrow{in_{\tilde{r}'}} & \tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}'} \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\ \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X & \xrightarrow{em'} & \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'}^X \end{array} \quad (1.4)$$

is commutative. Here π, π' are canonical projection maps, $\pi(\tilde{x}) := \{\tilde{y} \in \tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}} : \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = 0\}$ and $\pi'(\tilde{x}') := \{\tilde{y}' \in \tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}'} : \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}'}(\tilde{x}', \tilde{y}') = 0\}$.

Let X and Y be two metric spaces. Recall that a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called an *isometry* if f is distance-preserving and onto.

Definition 1.4. A pretangent $\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X$ is tangent if $em' : \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X \rightarrow \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'}^X$ is an isometry for every $\tilde{X}_{p,\tilde{r}'}$.

2 Betweenness exponent and ultrametricity of pretangent spaces

Let (X, d) be a metric spaces. Denote by $t_0 = t_0(X) = t_0(X, d)$ the supremum of positive numbers t for which the function $(x, y) \mapsto (d(x, y))^t$ is a metric on X . It is clear that d^{t_0} remains a metric if $t_0 = t_0(X) < \infty$. The quantity $t_0(X)$ will be called the *betweenness exponent* of the metric space (X, d) . The proofs of the following two lemmas can be found in [12].

Lemma 2.1. Let x, y and z be points in a metric space X . If the inequality

$$d(x, z) \vee d(z, y) < d(x, y) \quad (2.1)$$

holds, then there exists a unique solution $s_0 \in [1, \infty)$ of the equation

$$(d(x, z))^s + (d(z, y))^s = (d(x, y))^s. \quad (2.2)$$

For points x, y and z in X write

$$s(x, y, z) := \begin{cases} s_0 & \text{if (2.1) holds,} \\ +\infty & \text{if (2.1) does not hold} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

where s_0 is the unique root of equation (2.2).

Lemma 2.2. *The equality*

$$t_0(X) = \inf\{s(x, y, z) : x, y, z \in X\}$$

holds for every nonvoid metric space X .

Recall that a metric space (X, d) is *ultrametric* if the metric d satisfies the *ultra-triangle inequality* $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) \vee d(y, z)$ for all $x, y, z \in X$.

Remark 2.3. For ultrametric spaces X we have the equality $t_0(X) = \infty$ since inequality (2.1) never holds in these spaces. In fact $t_0(X) = \infty$ is true if and only if X is ultrametric.

For every metric space (Y, d) define the subset Y^{+3} of the Cartesian product $Y \times Y \times Y$ by the rule

$$(x, y, z) \in Y^{+3} \Leftrightarrow d(x, z) \geq d(x, y) \geq d(y, z) > 0. \quad (2.4)$$

It is clear that $Y^{+3} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\text{card } Y \geq 3$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let (X, d) be a metric space and let p be a limit point of X . If the equality*

$$\lim_{\substack{x, y, z \rightarrow p \\ (x, y, z) \in X^{+3}}} s(x, z, y) = s_0 \in [1, \infty], \quad (2.5)$$

holds, then for every $\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}} = \Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X$ and all $(\beta, \gamma, \delta) \in \Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^{+3}$ we have the equality

$$\rho(\beta, \delta) = ((\rho(\beta, \gamma))^{s_0} + (\rho(\delta, \gamma))^{s_0})^{\frac{1}{s_0}} \quad (2.6)$$

with

$$((\rho(\beta, \gamma))^{s_0} + (\rho(\delta, \gamma))^{s_0})^{\frac{1}{s_0}} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} ((\rho(\beta, \gamma))^t + (\rho(\delta, \gamma))^t)^{\frac{1}{t}} = \rho(\beta, \gamma) \vee \rho(\delta, \gamma)$$

if $s_0 = \infty$.

Proof. Let $(\beta, \gamma, \delta) \in \Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^{+3}$ where $\tilde{r} = \{r_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and let $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \beta$, $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \gamma$, $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \delta$. Let $(d_{[1]}^n, d_{[2]}^n, d_{[3]}^n)$ be a nonincreasing rearrangement of the vector $d^n := (d(x_n, z_n), d(x_n, y_n), d(y_n, z_n))$ i.e., the vectors d^n and $(d_{[1]}^n, d_{[2]}^n, d_{[3]}^n)$ have the same components but $d_{[1]}^n \geq d_{[2]}^n \geq d_{[3]}^n$. It is easy to see that there is a rearrangement (x_n^*, y_n^*, z_n^*) of $(x_n, y_n, z_n) \in X^3$ such that

$$(d_{[1]}^n, d_{[2]}^n, d_{[3]}^n) = (d(x_n^*, z_n^*), d(x_n^*, y_n^*), d(y_n^*, z_n^*)).$$

The last equality and the relation $(\beta, \gamma, \delta) \in \Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^{+3}$ imply

$$(x_n^*, y_n^*, z_n^*) \in X^{+3}$$

if n is taken large enough. Indeed, it is sufficient to show that $d_{[3]}^n > 0$ which follows from

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \rho(\gamma, \delta) &= (\rho(\gamma, \beta) \wedge \rho(\gamma, \delta) \wedge \rho(\beta, \delta)) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n} (d(x_n, z_n) \wedge d(x_n, y_n) \wedge d(y_n, z_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{[3]}^n}{r_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider first the case $s_0 < \infty$. Write $s_n := s(x_n^*, z_n^*, y_n^*)$ where the function s is define by (2.3). Now using (2.5) and (2.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\beta, \delta) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n} (d(x_n, z_n) \vee d(x_n, y_n) \vee d(y_n, z_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n^*, z_n^*)}{r_n} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left(\frac{d(x_n^*, y_n^*)}{r_n} \right)^{s_n} + \left(\frac{d(y_n^*, z_n^*)}{r_n} \right)^{s_n} \right)^{\frac{1}{s_n}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left(\frac{d_{[2]}^n}{r_n} \right)^{s_n} + \left(\frac{d_{[3]}^n}{r_n} \right)^{s_n} \right)^{\frac{1}{s_n}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

that implies equality (2.6) for $s_0 < \infty$.

Suppose now that $s_0 = \infty$. Let M be an arbitrary positive constant. Since the function $f(t) = (a^t + b^t)^{\frac{1}{t}}$, $a, b \in (0, \infty)$, is strictly decreasing in $t \in (0, \infty)$, see Remark 2.7 below, and since equality (2.5) holds with $s_0 = \infty$, we obtain the inequality

$$\frac{d(x_n^*, z_n^*)}{r_n} \leq \left(\left(\frac{d(x_n^*, y_n^*)}{r_n} \right)^M + \left(\frac{d(y_n^*, z_n^*)}{r_n} \right)^M \right)^{\frac{1}{M}}$$

for sufficiently large n . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\beta, \delta) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n^*, z_n^*)}{r_n} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left(\frac{d(x_n^*, y_n^*)}{r_n} \right)^M + \left(\frac{d(y_n^*, z_n^*)}{r_n} \right)^M \right)^{\frac{1}{M}} \leq ((\rho(\beta, \gamma))^M + (\rho(\gamma, \delta))^M)^{\frac{1}{M}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Letting $M \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\rho(\beta, \delta) \leq \rho(\beta, \gamma) \vee \rho(\gamma, \delta)$. The reverse inequality follows from the supposition $(\beta, \gamma, \delta) \in \Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^{+3}$ by (2.4). Thus (2.6) holds for all $s_0 \in [1, \infty]$. $\square$

Remark 2.5. Limit calculations in (2.7) – (2.8) are based on the following simple fact. If a sequence of vectors (x_1^n, x_2^n, x_3^n) tends to the vector (x_1, x_2, x_3) , then the sequence of their nonincreasing rearrangements $(x_{[1]}^n, x_{[2]}^n, x_{[3]}^n)$ tends to the rearrangement $(x_{[1]}, x_{[2]}, x_{[3]})$. Indeed, the classical Hardy–Littlewood–Polya inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^m a_i b_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^m a_{[i]} b_{[i]}, \quad a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

see, for example, [19, Chapter 6, A. 3], has as a consequence the estimation

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 (x_{[i]} - x_{[i]}^n)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^3 (x_i - x_i^n)^2.$$

Corollary 2.6. *If the metric space (X, d) is ultrametric, then all pretangent spaces $\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X$ are ultrametric for each $p \in X$.*

Remark 2.7. The sums

$$S_t(x) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^t \right)^{\frac{1}{t}}, \quad x_i \in (0, \infty),$$

decrease from $+\infty$ to $x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n$ when t increases from 0 to $+\infty$. The inequality $S_{t_2}(x) < S_{t_1}(x)$, $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \infty$, is sometimes referred to as the Jensen inequality. For the proof see, for example, [5].

As it was shown in Proposition 2.4 the condition

$$\lim_{\substack{x, y, z \rightarrow p \\ (x, y, z) \in X^{+3}}} s(x, z, y) = \infty$$

is sufficient for the ultrametricity of all pretangent spaces $\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X$ but it is not necessary as the following proposition shows.

Proposition 2.8. *For every $s_0 \in [1, \infty)$ there exists a metric space (X, d) with a marked point p such that*

$$\lim_{\substack{x, y, z \rightarrow p \\ (x, y, z) \in X^{+3}}} s(x, y, z) = s_0$$

but all pretangent spaces $\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X$ are ultrametric.

Proof. Let $\tilde{b} = \{b_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_n}{b_{n+1}} = \infty$. Let us consider the metric space (X, d) with

$$X = \{0\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{b_n\} \right) \text{ and } d(x, y) = |x - y|$$

and with a marked point $p = 0$. It simply follows from [13] that

$$\text{card } \Omega_{p, \tilde{b}}^X \leq 2$$

for each pretangent space $\Omega_{p, \tilde{b}}^X$. Consequently all these pretangent spaces are ultrametric.

Note now, that every triple $(x, y, z) \in X^3$ can be rearranged such that $d(x, z) = d(x, y) + d(z, y)$. Consequently, for this (X, d) , we have

$$\lim_{\substack{x, y, z \rightarrow p \\ (x, y, z) \in X^3}} s(x, y, z) = 1,$$

so the proposition follows for $s_0 = 1$. If $s_0 > 1$, then $d^{\frac{1}{s_0}}$ is also a metric on X . The space $(X, d^{\frac{1}{s_0}})$, the snowflaked version of (X, d) , is the desirable example. This proves the proposition. $\square$

Let (X, d) be a metric space with a marked point p . Define a function $F : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the rule

$$F(x, y) := \begin{cases} \frac{d(x, y)(d(x, p) \wedge d(y, p))}{(d(x, p) \vee d(y, p))^2} & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (p, p) \\ 0 & \text{if } (x, y) = (p, p). \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

Note that $0 \leq F(x, y) \leq 2$ for all x and y . Write

$$\Phi(x, y, z) := F(x, y) \vee F(x, z) \vee F(y, z) \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\Psi(x, y, z) := \frac{d(x, y) \vee d(y, z) \vee d(x, z)}{d(x, y) \wedge d(y, z) \wedge d(z, x)} \quad (2.11)$$

for all $x, y, z \in X$ where $\Psi(x, y, z) := \infty$ if $d(x, y) \wedge d(y, z) \wedge d(z, x) = 0$.

The following theorem is an ultrametricity criterion for pretangent spaces of general metric spaces.

Theorem 2.9. *Let (X, d) be a metric space with a marked point p . The following two statements are equivalent.*

- (i) All pretangent spaces $\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X$ are ultrametric.
(ii) We have the limit relation

$$\lim_{x,y,z \rightarrow p} \frac{s(x,y,z)}{\Phi(x,y,z)} \Psi(x,y,z) = \infty \quad (2.12)$$

where $\frac{1}{\Phi(x,y,z)} := \infty$ if $\Phi(x,y,z) = 0$.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Suppose statement (i) is true. If (2.12) does not hold, then there are $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ and sequences $\tilde{x} = \{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\tilde{y} = \{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\tilde{z} = \{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ from $\tilde{X}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = p$$

and that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s(x_n, y_n, z_n)}{\Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n)} \Psi(x_n, y_n, z_n) = \alpha.$$

Since the double inequalities $\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{\Phi(x,y,z)} \leq \infty$, $1 \leq \Psi(x,y,z) \leq \infty$ and $1 \leq s(x,y,z) \leq \infty$ hold for all $x, y, z \in X$, we can suppose, proceeding to a subsequence if it is necessary, that there exist the following limits

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(x_n, y_n, z_n) &=: \psi_0, & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n)} &=: \phi_0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s(x_n, y_n, z_n) &=: s_0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

with $\infty > \psi_0 \geq 1$, $\infty > \phi_0 \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and with $\infty > s_0 \geq 1$. It follows from (2.10) that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have at least one of the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_n, y_n) &= \Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n), & F(y_n, z_n) &= \Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n), \\ F(z_n, x_n) &= \Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose the first equality

$$F(x_n, y_n) = \Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n) \quad (2.14)$$

holds on an infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$. Then, passing once again to a subsequence, we take that (2.14) is true for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence the second equality in (2.13) can be rewritten as

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n, y_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, y_n)(d(x_n, p) \wedge d(y_n, p))}{(d(x_n, p) \vee d(y_n, p))^2} = \frac{1}{\phi_0} \in (0, 2]. \quad (2.15)$$

Analogously, we can suppose that the equality

$$d(x_n, p) = d(x_n, p) \vee d(y_n, p) \quad (2.16)$$

holds on some infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$ and passing to a subsequence, that this subset equals $\mathbb{N}$. Relations (2.15)–(2.16) imply the inequality $d(x_n, p) > 0$ for sufficiently large n . Write

$$r_n := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d(x_n, p) = 0 \\ d(x_n, p) & \text{if } d(x_n, p) > 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

and $\tilde{r} := \{r_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. We can now easily show that the quantities

$$\frac{d(x_n, p)}{r_n}, \quad \frac{d(y_n, p)}{r_n}, \quad \frac{d(z_n, p)}{r_n}, \quad \frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{r_n}, \quad \frac{d(x_n, z_n)}{r_n}, \quad \frac{d(y_n, z_n)}{r_n} \quad (2.18)$$

are bounded above by a constant. Indeed, for $\frac{d(x_n, p)}{r_n}$ and $\frac{d(y_n, p)}{r_n}$ it follows from (2.16)–(2.17) and for $\frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{r_n}$ from the triangle inequality

$$\frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{r_n} \leq \frac{d(x_n, p)}{r_n} + \frac{d(y_n, p)}{r_n}.$$

Since $\frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{r_n}$ is bounded above and the first limit in (2.13) is finite, the quantities $\frac{d(y_n, z_n)}{r_n}$ and $\frac{d(x_n, z_n)}{r_n}$ are also bounded above. Finally, the inequality

$$d(p, z_n) \leq d(p, x_n) + d(x_n, z_n)$$

implies the desirable boundedness of $\frac{d(z_n, p)}{r_n}$.

Since all quantities in (2.18) are bounded, there is a sequence $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of natural numbers for which all limits

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(y_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(z_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}, \\ & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_{n_k}, y_{n_k})}{r_{n_k}}, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_{n_k}, z_{n_k})}{r_{n_k}}, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(y_{n_k}, z_{n_k})}{r_{n_k}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

are finite. Renaming $\tilde{x} := \{x_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\tilde{y} := \{y_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\tilde{z} := \{z_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\tilde{r} := \{r_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ we obtain that $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}$ and $\tilde{p}$ are mutually stable w.r.t. $\tilde{r}$. We can now easily show that

$$\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \neq 0 \quad (2.20)$$

and that

$$\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \neq 0 \neq \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}). \quad (2.21)$$

For this purpose, note that (2.15) – (2.17) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n, y_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{r_n} \left(\frac{d(x_n, p)}{r_n} \wedge \frac{d(p, y_n)}{r_n} \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{r_n} \frac{d(p, y_n)}{r_n} = \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{y}) = \frac{1}{\phi_0} \in (0, 2], \end{aligned}$$

consequently relation (2.20) holds. Moreover (2.20) and the finiteness of the first limit in (2.13) imply (2.21).

Let $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X, \rho)$ be a pretangent space such that $\tilde{x} \in \beta$, $\tilde{y} \in \gamma$ и $\tilde{z} \in \delta$ for some $\beta, \gamma, \delta \in \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}$. The definition of the function $(x, y, z) \mapsto s(x, y, z)$ and the finiteness of the last limit in (2.13) imply the equality

$$\rho(\beta, \gamma) = \rho(\beta, \gamma) \vee \rho(\gamma, \delta) \vee \rho(\delta, \beta)$$

and, in addition, it follows from (2.20) – (2.21) that $\rho(\beta, \gamma) \wedge \rho(\gamma, \delta) \wedge \rho(\delta, \beta) > 0$. We may assume, without loss of generality, that

$$\rho(\beta, \gamma) \geq \rho(\gamma, \delta) \geq \rho(\delta, \beta) > 0,$$

that is $(\gamma, \beta, \delta) \in \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^{+3}$. Using the last limit relation in (2.13) and reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 2.4 we obtain the equality

$$\rho(\beta, \gamma) = ((\rho(\beta, \delta))^{s_0} + (\rho(\delta, \gamma))^{s_0})^{\frac{1}{s_0}}. \quad (2.22)$$

Since $s_0 \in [1, \infty)$, the last equality shows that $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X, \rho)$ is not an ultrametric space contrary to the assumption. To complete the proof of the implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) it suffices to observe that (2.22) was derived from relations (2.20) and (2.21) and that these two relations remain valid if the pair (x_n, y_n) in (2.14) is replaced by an arbitrary pair from the set $\{(x_n, z_n), (y_n, x_n), (y_n, z_n), (z_n, x_n), (z_n, y_n)\}$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Suppose now that (2.12) holds. We must prove that all pretangent spaces $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X, \rho)$ are ultrametric. To this end it suffices to show that for an arbitrary normalizing sequence $\tilde{r}$ the inequality

$$\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \leq \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \vee \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}) \quad (2.23)$$

holds for all mutually stable (w.r.t. $\tilde{r}$) $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} \in \tilde{X}$ whenever

$$\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \geq \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \geq \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}) > 0 \quad (2.24)$$

and whenever there are finite limits

$$\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, p)}{r_n}, \quad \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{p}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(y_n, p)}{r_n}, \quad \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{p}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(z_n, p)}{r_n} \quad (2.25)$$

where $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \tilde{x}$, $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \tilde{y}$, $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \tilde{z}$. Limit relation (2.12), the definition of Ψ and inequalities (2.24) imply

$$\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s(x_n, y_n, z_n)}{\Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n)} \Psi(x_n, y_n, z_n) = \frac{\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})}{\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s(x_n, y_n, z_n)}{\Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n)}.$$

Consequently we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s(x_n, y_n, z_n)}{\Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n)} = \infty \quad (2.26)$$

because, by (2.24), the quantity $\frac{\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})}{\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})}$ are finite and positive. If, in addition, the equality

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s(x_n, y_n, z_n) = \infty \quad (2.27)$$

holds, then reasoning as in the proof of the second part of Proposition 2.4 we obtain inequality (2.23). If (2.27) does not hold, then there are an infinite strictly increasing sequence $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of natural numbers and a constant $s_0 \in [1, \infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s(x_{n_k}, y_{n_k}, z_{n_k}) = s_0.$$

The last equality and (2.26) have as a consequence

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\Phi(x_{n_k}, y_{n_k}, z_{n_k})} = \infty. \quad (2.28)$$

It follows from this and (2.9)–(2.10) that

$$0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(d(x_{n_k}, p) \wedge d(y_{n_k}, p))d(x_{n_k}, y_{n_k})}{(d(x_{n_k}, p) \vee d(p, y_{n_k}))^2} = \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{d(x_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \wedge \frac{d(y_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}}{\left(\frac{d(x_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \vee \frac{d(y_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}\right)^2}$$

and consequently

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{d(x_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \wedge \frac{d(y_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}}{\left(\frac{d(x_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \vee \frac{d(y_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}\right)^2} = 0.$$

Similarly we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{d(x_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \wedge \frac{d(z_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}}{\left(\frac{d(x_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \vee \frac{d(z_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}\right)^2} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{d(y_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \wedge \frac{d(z_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}}{\left(\frac{d(y_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \vee \frac{d(z_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}}\right)^2} = 0. \quad (2.29)$$

Note that

$$\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) \vee \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{p}) \vee \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{p}) > 0 \quad (2.30)$$

because in the opposite case the triangle inequality implies $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) = \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}) = 0$, contrary to (2.24). Suppose that

$$\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) \vee \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{p}) \vee \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{p}) = \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{p}). \quad (2.31)$$

This equality and (2.29) imply

$$0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{p}))^2} \left(\frac{d(x_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \wedge \frac{d(z_{n_k}, p)}{r_{n_k}} \right) = \frac{\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})}{(\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{p}))^2},$$

i.e. $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) = 0$. Completely analogously we have $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{p}) = 0$. It means that $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = 0$ which implies (2.23). It still remains to note that similar arguments are applicable if the right side of (2.31) is $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ or $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{p})$ instead of $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{p})$. Hence in all cases (2.12) implies (2.23). $\square$

3 Metric betweenness in pretangent spaces

The purpose of this part of the paper is to obtain an analog of Theorem 2.9 for the pretangent spaces which are not ultrametric. Recall the following definition, see, for example, [20, p. 55].

Definition 3.1. *Let (X, d) be a metric space and let x, y, z be distinct points of X . The point y lies between points x and z if*

$$d(x, z) = d(x, y) + d(y, z). \quad (3.1)$$

Denote by $\mathfrak{M}$ the class of all metric spaces (X, d) such that (3.1) holds for all $x, y, z \in X$ whenever $d(x, z) \geq d(x, y) \geq d(y, z)$.

It is easy to see that $X \in \mathfrak{M}$ if and only if the betweenness exponent $t_0(Y) = 1$ for each $Y \subseteq X$ with $\text{card } Y \geq 3$. Proposition 2.4 shows that $t_0(\Theta) = s_0$ for every subspace Θ of pretangent space $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}, \rho)$ provided that $\text{card } \Theta \geq 3$ and limit relation (2.5) holds with $s_0 < \infty$. Thus the spaces $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X, \rho^{s_0})$ belong to $\mathfrak{M}$ under these conditions.

Theorem 3.2. *Let (X, d) be a metric space, p a limit point of X and s_1 a positive number. The membership relation*

$$(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X, \rho^{s_1}) \in \mathfrak{M} \quad (3.2)$$

holds for every pretangent space $\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X$ if and only if

$$\lim_{\substack{x, y, z \rightarrow p \\ (x, y, z) \in X^{+3}}} \frac{\Psi(x, y, z) s^2(x, y, z)}{\Phi(x, y, z) (s_1 - s(x, y, z))^2} = \infty \quad (3.3)$$

where $\left(\frac{s(x, y, z)}{s_1 - s(x, y, z)} \right)^2 := 1$ in the case $s(x, y, z) = \infty$.

Remark 3.3. Membership relation (3.2) means, in particular, that ρ^{s_1} is a metric on $\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X$. If $\text{card } \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X \geq 3$, then using Lemma 2.2 we see that s_1 equals the betweenness exponent of $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X, \rho)$ whenever (3.2) holds. Moreover (3.2) holds for all $s_1 > 0$ if and only if $\text{card } \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X \leq 2$.

The following proof succeeds the scheme of the proof of Theorem 2.9

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Suppose that (3.2) holds for all pretangent spaces $\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X$. We must prove that (3.3) holds. The direct calculations show that

$$\frac{(s(x, y, z))^2}{(s_1 - s(x, y, z))^2} \geq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_1 = 1 \\ 1 \wedge \frac{1}{(1-s_1)^2} & \text{if } s_1 \in (0, \infty) \setminus \{1\}. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Hence if (3.3) does not hold, then as in the case of (2.13) there is a sequence of triples $(x_n, y_n, z_n) \in X^{+3}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = p$$

and that the following finite positive limits exist

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(x_n, y_n, z_n) &= \psi_0, & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\Phi(x_n, y_n, z_n)} &= \phi_0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s^2(x_n, y_n, z_n)}{(s_1 - s(x_n, y_n, z_n))^2} &= s_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

The condition $(x_n, y_n, z_n) \in X^{+3}$ and (2.11) imply the equality

$$\Psi(x_n, y_n, z_n) = \frac{d(x_n, z_n)}{d(y_n, z_n)}$$

and the membership relations

$$\frac{d(x_n, z_n)}{d(x_n, y_n)}, \frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{d(y_n, z_n)} \in \left[1, \frac{d(x_n, z_n)}{d(y_n, z_n)} \right].$$

Consequently, replacing $\mathbb{N}$ by a suitable subset, we may suppose that there are finite constant ψ_1, ψ_2 such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, z_n)}{d(x_n, y_n)} := \psi_1, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{d(y_n, z_n)} := \psi_2 \quad (3.6)$$

and $\psi_1 \psi_2 = \psi_0$ and $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2 \geq 1$.

Using (3.5) and (3.6) and repeating the arguments from the first part of the proof of Theorem 2.9 we find a normalizing sequence $\tilde{r} = \{r_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that there are finite limits

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, p)}{r_n}, & \tilde{d}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{y}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(y_n, p)}{r_n}, & \tilde{d}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{z}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(z_n, p)}{r_n}, \\ \tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, y_n)}{r_n}, & \tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_n, z_n)}{r_n}, & \tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(y_n, z_n)}{r_n} \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

and, in addition, the inequalities

$$\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \geq \tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \geq \tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) > 0 \quad (3.8)$$

hold. Note that (3.7) is similar to (2.19) and (3.8) can be obtained as (2.20) – (2.21).

Let us consider now the limit relation

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s^2(x_n, y_n, z_n)}{(s_1 - s(x_n, y_n, z_n))^2} = s_2. \quad (3.9)$$

We first establish that $s_2 \neq 1$. As usual, replacing $\mathbb{N}$ by a suitable infinite subset, we may suppose that there is the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s(x_n, y_n, z_n) = s_0 \in [1, \infty]. \quad (3.10)$$

If $s_0 = +\infty$, then, as in the proof of Proposition 2.4, we can obtain the equality

$$\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) = \tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \vee \tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}). \quad (3.11)$$

Furthermore, it follows from (3.2) that

$$\left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z})\right)^{s_1} = \left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\right)^{s_1} + \left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})\right)^{s_1}. \quad (3.12)$$

Equalities (3.11) and (3.12) imply the equality $\tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) = 0$, contrary to (3.8). Hence the limit in (3.10) is finite. If $s_2 = 1$, then using (3.9) we have

$$\frac{s_0^2}{(s_0 - s_1)^2} = 1,$$

that is $s_0 = s_1/2$. From this we obtain

$$\left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z})\right)^{\frac{s_1}{2}} = \left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\right)^{\frac{s_1}{2}} + \left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})\right)^{\frac{s_1}{2}} \quad (3.13)$$

in the same manner as in the case $s_0 = \infty$. It contradicts (3.12) because the function

$$f(s) = \left(\left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\right)^s + \left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})\right)^s\right)^{\frac{1}{s}}, \quad (3.14)$$

is strictly decreasing in s . Thus $s_2 \neq 1$ as it was indicated.

Let us analyze now the possible value of s_0 in (3.10). It was noted above that $s_0 \neq \infty$ because $s_2 \neq 1$. Hence s_0 is a root of the equation

$$\frac{x^2}{(x - s_1)^2} = s_2$$

where $s_2 \in (1, \infty)$. Since $s_2 \neq 1$, two possible values of s_0 are

$$\frac{s_1\sqrt{s_2}}{1+\sqrt{s_2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{-s_1\sqrt{s_2}}{1-\sqrt{s_2}}, \quad (3.15)$$

where we put $\sqrt{s_2} > 0$. It follows from (3.15) that $s_0 \neq s_1$ because if $s_0 = s_1$, then

$$s_1(1+\sqrt{s_2}) = s_1\sqrt{s_2} \quad \text{or} \quad s_1(1-\sqrt{s_2}) = -s_1\sqrt{s_2},$$

i.e., $s_1 = 0$ which contradicts the conditions of the theorem. As in (3.13) we obtain

$$\left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z})\right)^{s_0} = \left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\right)^{s_0} + \left(\tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})\right)^{s_0}.$$

The last equality contradicts (3.12) because function (3.14) is strictly decreasing on $(0, \infty)$ and $s_0 \neq s_1$.

It follows that the positive constant s_2 in (3.5) and (3.9) cannot be finite, contrary to the assumption. Thus the limit relation (3.3) holds if all spaces $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X, \rho^{s_1})$ belong to $\mathfrak{M}$.

Suppose now that limit relation (3.3) holds. We must prove that for every pretangent space $\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X$ the equality

$$(\rho(\beta, \delta))^{s_1} = (\rho(\beta, \gamma))^{s_1} + (\rho(\gamma, \delta))^{s_1} \quad (3.16)$$

holds for all $\beta, \gamma, \delta \in \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X$ whenever

$$\rho(\beta, \delta) \geq \rho(\beta, \gamma) \geq \rho(\gamma, \delta). \quad (3.17)$$

Since (3.17) is trivial for $\rho(\gamma, \delta) = 0$, we assume

$$\rho(\gamma, \delta) > 0. \quad (3.18)$$

Note that (3.17) together with (3.18) are an equivalent of $(\beta, \gamma, \delta) \in \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^{+3}$.

Let $(\beta, \gamma, \delta) \in \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^{+3}$ is given and let

$$\tilde{x}^* = \{x_n^*\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \beta, \quad \tilde{y}^* = \{y_n^*\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \gamma, \quad \tilde{z}^* = \{z_n^*\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \delta. \quad (3.19)$$

At least one of the six rearrangements of the points x_n^*, y_n^*, z_n^* belongs to X^{+3} for n belonging to some infinite subsequence $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of natural numbers. We denote by x_n the first element of this rearrangement, by y_n the second and by z_n the third one. Using, as usual, $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ instead of the sequence of all natural numbers we may suppose that $(x_k, y_k, z_k) \in X^{+3}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Write $\tilde{x} := \{x_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\tilde{y} := \{y_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\tilde{z} := \{z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Relations (3.19) imply the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}'}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_k, z_k)}{r_{n_k}} = \rho(\beta, \delta), & \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}'}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_k, y_k)}{r_{n_k}} = \rho(\beta, \gamma), \\ \tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}'}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(y_k, z_k)}{r_{n_k}} = \rho(\gamma, \delta), \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

see Remark 2.5. Moreover, it follows directly from definitions of $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}$ that there are finite limits

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_k, p)}{r_{n_k}}, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(y_k, p)}{r_{n_k}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(z_k, p)}{r_{n_k}}.$$

Consequently the family $\{\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, \tilde{p}'\}$ is self-stable w.r.t. $\tilde{r}' = \{r_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Using (3.20) we can rewrite (3.16) in the equivalent form

$$\left(\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}'}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z})\right)^{s_1} = \left(\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}'}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\right)^{s_1} + \left(\tilde{d}_{\tilde{r}'}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})\right)^{s_1}. \quad (3.21)$$

Reasoning as in the proof of (2.26) we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s^2(x_k, y_k, z_k)}{\Phi(x_k, y_k, z_k)(s_1 - s(x_k, y_k, z_k))^2} = \infty.$$

If, in addition, the equality

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s(x_k, y_k, z_k) = s_1$$

is true, then, using the first part of the proof of Proposition 2.4, we see that (3.21) holds. In the opposite case there is an infinite strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers k_m , $m \in \mathbb{N}$, for which, similarly (2.28), we obtain

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\Phi(x_{k_m}, y_{k_m}, z_{k_m})} = \infty.$$

Now the equality (3.21) can be proved by the repetition of the arguments which stay after (2.28). $\square$

In the following corollary and further we assume that $\mathbb{R}$ is the set of all real numbers with the usual metric $d(x, y) = |x - y|$.

Corollary 3.4. *Let (X, d) be a metric space with a limit point p , $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X, \rho)$ a pretangent space to X at the point p and s_1 a positive number. If (3.3) holds for this s_1 , then each one from the following conditions is sufficient that the space $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X, \rho)$ be tangent.*

- (i) *There is no any isometric embeddings of $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X, \rho^{s_1})$ in $\mathbb{R}$.*
- (ii) *The space $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}^X, \rho^{s_1})$ is isometric to $\mathbb{R}$.*

To prove this we will use the following particular case of the classical Menger's result on the isometric embeddings into Euclidean spaces.

Theorem 3.5 (*K. Menger*). *Let $Y \in \mathfrak{M}$ be a metric space with $\text{card } Y \geq 5$. Then Y is isometric to some subset of $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proof of Corollary 3.4. Suppose that condition (i) is fulfilled and (3.3) is true. Since (3.3) holds, we have, by Theorem 3.2, that $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X, \rho^{s_1}) \in \mathfrak{M}$. Using Menger's theorem 3.5 we see that

$$\text{card } \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}} = 4. \quad (3.22)$$

If $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X, \rho)$ is not tangent, then there is a pretangent space $\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'}^X$ such that

$$\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'} \setminus \text{em}'(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}) \neq \emptyset \quad (3.23)$$

for the isometric embedding $\text{em}' : \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X \rightarrow \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'}^X$, see Definition 1.4. Since $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'}^X, \rho^{s_1})$ also belongs to $\mathfrak{M}$, relations (3.22) – (3.23) imply the inequality

$$\text{card } \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'} \geq 5.$$

Hence, by Menger's theorem, there exists an isometric embedding f of $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'}^X, \rho^{s_1})$ into $\mathbb{R}$. Now the superposition $\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X \xrightarrow{\text{em}'} \Omega_{p,\tilde{r}'}^X \xrightarrow{f} \mathbb{R}$ is an isometric embedding of $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X, \rho^{s_1})$ in $\mathbb{R}$, contrary to (i).

Let condition (ii) and (3.3) be fulfilled. In order that $(\Omega_{p,\tilde{r}}^X, \rho)$ be tangent, it suffices to show each isometric embedding $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Y$ is a bijection if $Y \in \mathfrak{M}$. Suppose an isometric embedding $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Y$, $Y \in \mathfrak{M}$, is not bijective. Let $a \in Y \setminus f(\mathbb{R})$ and let $b \in f(\mathbb{R})$. Write $s := \rho(a, b)$ where ρ is the metric on Y . Then there are two distinct points $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ for which

$$|f^{-1}(b) - p_1| = |f^{-1}(b) - p_2| = s.$$

Consequently we have

$$\rho(b, f(p_1)) = \rho(b, f(p_2)) = \rho(b, a) = s > 0$$

where all three points $f(p_1)$, $f(p_2)$ and b are distinct. Theorem 3.5 implies that (Y, ρ) can be isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}$. Let $g : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a such embedding. Then the points $g(b)$, $g(f(p_1))$ and $g(f(p_2))$ are distinct points of the sphere $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |g(a) - x| = s\}$. It is impossible because every "sphere" in $\mathbb{R}$ contains only two points. $\square$

Remark 3.6. The four-point metric spaces $Y \in \mathfrak{M}$ which cannot be isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}$ are sometimes referred to as pseudo-linear quadruples. It is well known that (Y, d) is a pseudo-linear quadruples if and only if the points of Y can be labelled p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3 such that

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_0, p_1) = d(p_2, p_3) = s, \quad d(p_1, p_2) = d(p_0, p_3) = t, \\ d(p_0, p_2) = d(p_1, p_3) = s + t \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

where s and t are some positive constants. See, for example, [6, p. 114].

Each pseudo-linear quadruples can be easily realized as a subset of the two-dimensional linear normed space l_∞^2 where, as usual, the norm is

$$\|(x_1, x_2)\| = |x_1| \vee |x_2|.$$

To this end we put

$$p_0 = (0, 0), \quad p_1 = (s, s), \quad p_2 = (s + t, s - t), \quad p_3 = (t, -t) \quad (3.25)$$

Simple calculations show that equalities (3.24) hold in this case.

Realization (3.25) leads us to the examples of metric spaces which have the pseudo-linear quadruples as tangent spaces.

Example 3.7. Let $\tilde{r} = \{r_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a decreasing sequence of positive numbers such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n / r_{n+1} = +\infty$ and let $t, s \in (0, \infty)$. Write $Y := \{p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ where p_i , $i = 0, \dots, 3$ are the points of l_∞^2 which were defined by (3.25) and set

$$X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} r_n Y$$

with $r_n Y = \{r_n p : p \in Y\}$. Consider the metric space (X, d) with the metric d induced from the space l_∞^2 . It is easy to see that the sequences $\tilde{x}_i := \{r_n p_i\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $i = 0, \dots, 3$, are mutually stable w.r.t. the normalizing sequence $\tilde{r}$. Furthermore, it can be shown that there is a unique maximal self-stable family $\tilde{X}_{p_0, \tilde{r}}$ and that

$$\text{card } \Omega_{p_0, \tilde{r}}^X = 4, \quad p_0 = (0, 0),$$

where $\Omega_{p_0, \tilde{r}}^X$ is the metric identification of $\tilde{X}_{p_0, \tilde{r}}$. Equalities (3.24) imply that $\Omega_{p_0, \tilde{r}}^X$ is isometric to the pseudo-linear quadruples and, consequently, is tangent by Corollary 3.4.

Remark 3.8. Some details dropped under consideration of the above example can be easily regenerated from [13].

The next corollary of Theorem 3.2 clarifies "the geometrical sense" of the factor $\Phi(x, y, z)$ in limit relation (3.3).

Corollary 3.9. *Let (X, d) be a metric space and let p be a limit point of X . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}, \rho^{s_1}) \in \mathfrak{M}$ for every pretangent $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}, \rho)$ and all $s_1 \in (0, \infty)$;
- (ii) $\text{card } \Omega_{p, \tilde{r}} \leq 2$ for every pretangent $(\Omega_{p, \tilde{r}}, \rho)$;
- (iii) $\lim_{x, y \rightarrow p} F(x, y) = 0$ where the function F was defined by (2.9);
- (iv) $\lim_{\substack{x, y, z \rightarrow p \\ (x, y, z) \in X^{+3}}} \Phi(x, y, z) = 0$ where the function Φ was defined by (2.10).

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). It follows from the definition of $\mathfrak{M}$ and from Remark 2.7.
(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) was proved in [13].
(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv) is immediate from the definitions of the functions Φ and F .
(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i). To prove this note that (iv) implies (3.3) because the values of

$$\frac{\Psi(x, y, z)s^2(x, y, z)}{(s_1 - s(x, y, z))^2}$$

are bounded away from zero. Thus (i) follows by Theorem 3.2. $\square$

Acknowledgment. The first author was partially supported by the State Foundation for Basic Researches of Ukraine, Grant Φ 25.1/055.

References

- [1] L. Ambrosio, *Metric space valued functions of bounded variation*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4), **17**, (1990), N 3, 439–478.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, *Fine properties of sets of finite perimeter in doubling metric measure spaces*, Set-Valued Anal., **10** (2002), N 2–3, 111–128.
- [3] L. Ambrosio, B. Kirchheim, *Currents in metric spaces*, Acta Math. **185** (2000), N 2, 1–80.
- [4] L. Ambrosio, B. Kirchheim, *Rectifiable sets in metric and Banach spaces*, Math. Ann., **318** (2000), N 3, 527–555.
- [5] E. F. Beckenbach, *An inequality of Jensen*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **53**, 1946, 501–505.
- [6] L. M. Blumenthal, *Theory and Applications of Distance Geometry*, Calderon Press, Oxford, 1953.
- [7] M. Bridson, A. Haefliger, *Metric Spaces of Non-positive Curvature*, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [8] Y. Burago, M. Gromov, G. Perelman, *A. D. Alexandrov spaces with curvatures bounded below*, Russian Math. Surveys. **47** (2), 1992, 1–56.
- [9] D. Burago, Y. Burago, S. Ivanov, *A Course in Metric Geometry*, American Mathematical Society. Providence, Rhode Island, 2001.
- [10] J. Cheeger, *Differentiability of Lipschitz functions on metric measure spaces*, GAFA, Geom. Func. Anal. **9**, (1999), 428–517.

- [11] O. Dovgoshey, *Tangent spaces to metric spaces and to their subspaces*, Ukrain. Math. Bull. **5** (4), 2008, 468–485.
- [12] O. Dovgoshey, O. Martio, *Blow up of balls and coverings in metric spaces*, Manuscripta Math, **127**, 2008, 39–120.
- [13] O. Dovgoshey, O. Martio, *Tangent spaces to metric spaces*, Reports in Math., Helsinki Univ., **480**, (2008), 20p.
- [14] P. Hajlasz, *Sobolev spaces on an arbitrary metric space*, Potential Anal. **5**, (1996), 403–415.
- [15] J. Heinonen, *Lectures on Analysis on Metric Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [16] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, *From local to global in quasiconformal structures*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **93**, (1996), 554–556.
- [17] A. Lytchak, *Differentiation in metric spaces*, St. Petersburg Math. J. **16**, 2005, 1017–1041.
- [18] K. Menger, *Untersuchungen über allgemeine Metrik*, I-III Math. Ann., **100**, 1928, 75–163.
- [19] A. Marshall, I. Olkin, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*, Academic Press, New York etc., 1979.
- [20] A. Papadopoulos, *Metric Space, Convexity and Nonpositive Curvature*, European Mathematical Society, Zürich, 2005.
- [21] N. Shanmugalingam, *Newtonian space: an extension of Sobolev spaces to metric measure spaces*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamer. **16**, (2000), 243–279.

Oleksiy Dovgoshey

Institute of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics of NASU, R.Luxemburg
str. 74, Donetsk 83114, Ukraine.

E-mail: aleksdov@mail.ru.

Dmytro Dordovskyi

Institute of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics of NASU, R.Luxemburg
str. 74, Donetsk 83114, Ukraine.

E-mail: dordovskydmitry@gmail.com.